

**Napa County Workshop  
May 20, 2008, 6 p.m.-8 p.m.  
Napa City-County Library  
Napa, CA**

Some 40 people were in attendance. Commissioner Bill Dodd offered introductory remarks. Participants watched a 12-minute video, and then had the opportunity to answer a series of questions via electronic voting. A discussion followed each question, where participants were able to bring up other issues, questions and concerns.

***The Three E's***

How would you rank these three goals?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Economy	28	32.18%
Environment	29	33.33%
Equity	30	34.48%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>100%</b>

***Maintenance***

Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Option A: making investments to maintain the existing system of roads, and the existing bus, rail and ferry services in the region	20	71.43%
Option B: making investments to build new roads and add more bus, rail and ferry services in the region	8	28.57%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Comments:**

- Option A because it is the lesser of two evils; should split A, let roads crumble, fund public transit
- We don't need more roads; at a minimum we need to improve bus and rail systems; also, given that we don't have a lot of money should spend \$ on Option B
- If we don't improve roads, it will slow traffic
- I voted for Option A because it's a better investment; if we maintain Hwy 29 and make it flow better, it will benefit the entire Napa region; 75% of trips in Napa are regional in nature; in the long term, additional bus and rail are needed to invigorate this region so that American Canyon and Napa and develop more mixed-use developments
- Option B includes roads in it; we need more buses and rail, but not more roads; we don't need new roads
- We need new bike facilities: bike pads, bike racks on buses and ferries, bike lockers in transit centers

How much of our \$30M should be spent on maintenance?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Up to 25% (\$7.5 billion)	9	32.14%
Up to 50% (\$15 billion)	12	42.86%
Up to 75% (\$22.5 billion)	7	25%
100% (\$30 billion)	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

## *Congestion Relief*

Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Option A: Investing in <u>highway</u> system to relieve traffic congestion. (For example, ramp metering, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes.)	3	9.38%
Option B: Investing in <u>public transit</u> options including rail and buses to provide alternatives to driving.	19	59.38%
Option C: Investing in <u>walking paths and bicycle lanes</u> to provide alternatives to driving.	10	31.25%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Comments:**

- Option B is more viable; unless you're really just going locally, then walking/biking infrastructure alone is insufficient; need to get folks off highways
- Since 50% of congestion is due to accidents, you'd get less of the problem if you have Option B
- Option C: currently no connection from Bay Trail to Jameson Canyon
- Can't haul goods on bikes
- Option B because you can include both B and C together
- Option B is the better option because the alternatives I need are for long distance traveling
- We need to help the highway system to/from San Francisco or other places of employment; Option B doesn't meet the needs of commuters going to San Francisco; the challenge is that there are no buses/rail going to San Francisco; there are no bike trails to go to SF
- What would it take to have an underground train?
- More ferries to connect to Napa area
- Option B seems to support the goal of Equity the most; Option C seems to be great thing but doesn't affect disabled or elderly
- Need to improve public transit

What do you think is the best way to share the road with trucks?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Keep trucks out of the peak commuter hours	8	25.81%
Allow smaller trucks to use carpool lanes during congested periods for a fee	1	3.23%

Encourage more cargo deliveries be made by rail or ferries	16	51.61%
Build exclusive truck lanes supported by trucking fees	5	16.13%
Provide more truck parking in commercial business areas	1	3.23%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Comments:**

- Coordinate the movement of trucks to destinations

## ***Focused Growth***

**Which of these should be a higher investment priority?**

	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
<u>Option A:</u> Providing more transportation funds to communities that are planning to build more housing along BART and other public transit lines	24	75%
<u>Option B:</u> Providing transportation funds evenly to communities regardless of where they are planning to build homes	8	25%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Comments:**

- How else are you going to achieve your goal without Option A? Need money to achieve the policy.
- Need to encourage the type of planning that you want
- Here in Napa we are planning to build a bus terminal and housing in the same complex (rail will also be there)
- Option B because communities should be able to decide where they want to build that is not necessarily near BART
- Option B because American Canyon can only become a smart growth community if we have the funding to attract rail, to have a downtown rail station, and a complete bus facility
- Option A is a nice idea but sounds a lot like a commune situation

## ***Access***

**Transit Subsidy Based on Income:** Transit fare discounts are currently given to youth, seniors, and the disabled. In addition to these subsidies, do you think there should be a subsidy for low-income transit riders?

There should be a subsidy for low income riders.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	10	30.30%
Agree	8	24.24%
Neutral	9	27.27%
Disagree	2	6.06%

Strongly Disagree	4	12.12%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Comments:**

- It's not legal in the State of California to award things by people's income
- the problem is that too many think that transit is a welfare service; if you provide a subsidy, you should provide it in a form that's related to work, rather than using transportation funds
- It's fine as is with youth, senior, and disabled
- The businesses have an opportunity to support transit subsidies; some schools do that; we need to shift the focus from public subsidies only
- We need to eventually take cars off of welfare; for example, this new parking garage is a problem
- I voted neutral because I don't get the sense that fares is the reason holding back folks from taking transit; the problems is more related to whether transit takes them to where they want to go when they want to go

I favor basing all transit fare subsidies on income rather than age or disability.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Strongly Agree	0	0%
Agree	1	3.45%
Neutral	7	24.14%
Disagree	11	37.93%
Strongly Disagree	10	34.48%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Comments:**

- I'm concerned about the subsidies given to folks to drive to Park & Rides (free parking)
- We will ill get widely adopted use of transit only if it's affordable and widely available; how will you enforce subsidy based on income?

***Emissions Reduction***

**Which of these should be a higher investment priority?**

	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Option A: Focusing on reducing tailpipe emissions and encouraging alternatives to driving.	27	90%
Option B: Improving our ability to drive more easily around the Bay Area.	3	10%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Comments:**

- Option A makes sense; for example, allow folks to drive to a Park & Ride and catch a ferry

- The road system is at capacity; the increase in car ownership that providing more lanes will lead to more congestion

Which programs do you think are most effective to reduce the amount of CO2 emissions?	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Subsidize purchase of newer/cleaner vehicles	1	3.12%
Provide more/cheaper public transit	10	31.25%
Develop regional awareness campaign to encourage people to reduce fossil fuel use	5	15.62%
Build more bike paths and sidewalks	5	15.62%
Funding incentives to cities to allow more development near transit	7	21.88%
Support local traffic signal timing coordination	4	12.50%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Comments:

- the state of the art in public transit is abysmal; I see the empty train rails along Jameson Canyon and would love to take the train to work; the Vine is not viable with one hour headways
- I agree; it's embarrassing to see rail sitting there not being used; I'd take the rails using eminent domain in a heartbeat
- Wine Train takes funding away from commuter buses
- If there were hubs, we should focus buses; we do have some major employers in Napa; maybe we don't need big buses, could use smaller buses; we don't have a huge capital outlay
- It would be great to take a bus to work; but given the suburban land use, we need to include the car in the equation; it would be nice to have more buses and park & rides
- I think the bus service like the Vine going to Vallejo Ferry would be a lot more attractive; if we keep on improving highways, there would be no incentive to take the bus
- There was a recent announcement by a company to build a facility near the railroad tracks
- I would like to put in a plug to put in bicycle trails along rail tracks; need connection between American Canyon and Fairfield, etc.

### *Investment Tradeoffs*

You have \$10 – Click each number once for each dollar you want to spend.	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Maintenance	69	25.56%
Congestion Relief	40	14.81%
Focus Growth	70	25.93%
Access	29	10.74%
Emissions Reduction	62	22.96%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>100%</b>

## *New Revenues*

Which of the following new revenue sources would you support? (Multiple answers OK)	Responses	
	Count	Percentage
Regional gas fee	16	20%
Higher bridge toll	7	8.75%
Road tolls	10	12.50%
Vehicle registration fees	13	16.25%
County transportation sales taxes	23	28.75%
Other new revenues	7	8.75%
No new fees or increases	4	5%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Comments:**

- Gas taxes are high; bridge tolls are high
- I don't want any more tolls; I support the proposed sales tax because the County and cities need the money for their exclusive use in their local areas, such as fixing potholes
- I would echo that; sales tax gives you local control
- A regional gas fee will get people out of their cars; a sales tax is very regressive; how about a county gas fee?
- I like to push on new revenues: parking fees at BART, park & rides; fund bike paths, which are zero emissions, zero congestion
- I voted for no new fees
- I like road tolls because you pay as you go, it's equitable
- I'm for 1 through 6; we've expect to have everything for free; people want services, roads without potholes, mobility; that's not going to come free; we as a society need to have the political will to assume the responsibility to pay for things we want
- the amount of visitors to this county is increasing rapidly; we have a lot of hotel rooms to be developed; let's use part of a hotel tax to fund potholes and other infrastructure

### *Open Comments:*

County	Category	Comment
Napa	Raise gas tax	The way gas is taxed is ridiculous; still just paying \$0.38/gallon is insufficient
Napa	Bicycles	I like the MTC is tackling the projects; the implementation of the regional bicycle plan is critical; it's very hard to ride to Fairfield, Petaluma; we would also like to see a Safe Routes to School program, get kids starting to walk/bike to school will reduce traffic and make kids healthier; on a regional note, we would like to see improved bridge access by bike – we don't have access to southern crossing bridge
Napa	Rail Ferries Regional airports	We should explore the use of ferries for the entire Bay Area region; should be able to take a ferry to Redwood or San Jose area; a rail on Jameson Canyon can go west to Sonoma and the SMART rail;

		continue to work with our regional small airports to advance their capabilities
Napa	Connectivity	Need better regional connectivity for bike paths; some paths are narrow and hazardous; there's no rail in the Napa plan; rail is such key infrastructure; can move incredible number of freight and people; the ROW exist throughout the Bay Area; we have excellent potential rail infrastructure that are not being utilized
Napa	Bicycles	On I-80 there are no parallel local bike route; in effect, access is denied to people who wants to go to Fairfield
Napa	Bicycles	Geary Road will be reconstructed in two weeks, new bike path
Napa	Bicycles	Make bikeway on RT 29 safer; especially for visitors
Napa	Senior transportation	We need more attention on senior transportation; we are aging and living longer; we need to look at new philosophical and legislative ways to address older folks transport
Napa	Bicycles	Put in bicycle toll roads to fund for their construction
Napa	Funding	Gas tax money should go to transportation needs, not the general fund

### *Demographic Questions asked at Workshop:*

<b>1.) How did you get here this evening?</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Drove	17	56.67%
Public Transportation	0	0%
Carpool	2	6.67%
Bike	4	13.33%
Walked	7	23.33%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>2.) How would you describe yourself?</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Business Advocate	9	12.50%
Environmental Advocate	13	18.06%
Community Advocate	19	26.39%
Government/Agency Staff	9	12.50%
Concerned Individual	19	26.39%
Social Justice Advocate	2	2.78%
Elected Official	1	1.39%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>3.) How did you hear about tonight's meeting?</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Flyer	7	20.59%
Website	0	0%
Email	19	55.88%
Other	8	23.53%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **4.) Do you use public transportation**

regularly? (one to two times a week)

	Responses	
Yes	4	11.76%
No	30	88.24%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100%</b>

**5.) Have you attended a public meeting or workshop on Bay Area transportation in the past?**

	Responses	
Yes	25	75.76%
No	8	24.24%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>

**6.) What County do you live in?**

	Responses	
Alameda	0	0%
Contra Costa	0	0%
Marin	0	0%
Napa	27	79.41%
San Francisco	1	2.94%
San Mateo	0	0%
Santa Clara	0	0%
Solano	3	8.82%
Sonoma	3	8.82%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100%</b>

**7.) What is your gender?**

	Responses	
Male	26	78.79%
Female	7	21.21%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>

**8.) Are you Hispanic/Latino?**

	Responses	
Yes	4	12.90%
No	27	87.10%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

**9.) How do you identify yourself (click all that apply)**

	Responses	
White	27	84.38%
Chinese	0	0%
Vietnamese	0	0%



Asian/Indian	0	0%
Black/African American	1	3.12%
Japanese	0	0%
Filipino	0	0%
American Indian/Alaskan	2	6.25%
Other Asian	1	3.12%
Other Race	1	3.12%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>10.) What is your age?</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
24 years and under	0	0%
Between 25 and 59	23	67.65%
Over 60	11	32.35%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100%</b>

### *Meeting Evaluation Questions Asked at Workshops:*

<b>30.) I had the opportunity to provide comments.</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Strongly Agree	13	56.52%
Agree	8	34.78%
Neutral	2	8.70%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>31.) I found the meeting useful and informative.</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Strongly Agree	9	34.62%
Agree	12	46.15%
Neutral	3	11.54%
Disagree	2	7.69%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>32.) I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives.</b>	<b>Responses</b>	
Strongly Agree	8	32%
Agree	7	28%
Neutral	9	36%
Disagree	1	4%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

**33.) The information presented was clear and had an appropriate level of detail.**

	<b>Responses</b>	
Strongly Agree	4	14.29%
Agree	17	60.71%
Neutral	6	21.43%
Disagree	1	3.57%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

**34.) A quality discussion of key issues took place.**

	<b>Responses</b>	
Strongly Agree	2	8%
Agree	14	56%
Neutral	5	20%
Disagree	3	12%
Strongly Disagree	1	4%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

**35.) I learned more about transportation planning in the Bay Area by participating tonight.**

	<b>Responses</b>	
Strongly Agree	5	20%
Agree	14	56%
Neutral	4	16%
Disagree	2	8%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

**36.) There were no barriers (language or other) that prevented me from participating.**

	<b>Responses</b>	
Strongly Agree	16	61.54%
Agree	9	34.62%
Neutral	1	3.85%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>